

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3728.Palm)

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-29 are now pending in this application.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 6 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,785) in view of Sakai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,510,809) and Makela et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,047,196). As discussed in the previous Office Action reply, Kim teaches a portable display device in which two halves of the display are folded over one another such that the display surfaces, when folded, face each other and therefore are concealed from view. In the folded position, the display is not usable. One can use the display only when the two halves are folded apart. Further, when this display is used, a user must unfold the display and then slide the two halves together to form a single display.

The Examiner asserts that Sakai teaches a controller including a key KY7 that is assigned the function of a panel expansion key for instructing the panel expansion to be displayed under the display device. Applicants respectfully submit that the panel expansion key KY7 of Sakai et al. is not a sensor that is coupled to the processor where the sensor is configured to provide a signal representative of the physical size of the display. Key KY7 controls different graphical user interfaces being displayed on a fixed sized display in Sakai et al. Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Sakai et al., col. 10, lines 15-47 where it is described the function of display expanding key KY7 as a key in which different graphical user interfaces are displayed on the fixed size display as well as different panels being generated by the operating panel

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3728.Palm)

generating means to be displayed to the user. Accordingly, the element of a sensor for detecting the size of the display is missing from the teachings of Sakai et al., as well as from the teachings of Kim and Makela et al. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 18 may not be rendered obvious by the combination of Kim, Sakai et al., and Makela et al. Further, the Examiner indicates that neither Kim nor Sakai et al. teaches an expandable display such that the display is being viewable by a user in both the first size and second size configurations. The Examiner asserts that Makela et al. teaches a large display (12) of a device comprising two sections, whereby one obtains a total display area which corresponds to about twice the cross section of the folded device. The Examiner indicates that "as shown on FIG. 5, Makela et al. illustrates a display (9) on folded position, and a larger display (12) on unfolded position." Applicants respectfully submit that the display which the Examiner is interpreting as an expandable display of Makela et al. is not an expandable display. That is, the display may not be used in a first size configuration and a second size configuration. What is taught in Makela et al. is two different displays of two different sizes being used for different purposes. For example, the display (9) is a different display than the display (12) in Makela et al. Display (9) is used, for example, displaying telephone numbers being called or telephone names and numbers of incoming calls. However, display (12), which is foldable, is a single display of a single size in the unfolded position which may be used to display other types of information, such as text and graphical information. These two displays are distinct and different displays and therefore are not an expandable display as claimed by Applicants in independent Claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, the expandable display recited is missing from the references of Kim, Makela et al. and Sakai et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 and 18 and their respective claims are therefore allowable.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 2-5, 14-17 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Sakai et al., Makela et al. and Kung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,583).

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3728.Palm)

The Examiner asserts that regard "regarding Claims 14 and 26, Kim, Sakai et al. and Makela et al. have been discussed." Applicants further assert that the arguments with respect to the elements missing from the references of Kim, Sakai et al. and Makela et al. are also applicable to independent Claims 14 and 26.

Further, the Examiner asserts that Kung et al. teaches the zooming or reformatting of the display image on the display. However, all that Kung et al. teaches is the resizing of displayed images based on a user input. What is recited in Applicants' claims is reformatting of the display according to the sensor information, not through a manual switch which was to be used by a user. The difference is that there is no sensing going on in Kung et al. because the display is a fixed sized display and no expandability of the display is taught and therefore the information displayed on the display screen just needs to be resized for easier reading. As taught by Kung et al., "the display 14 is quite small." Accordingly, the only motivation provided by Kung et al. is to reformat the display in accordance with a manual input. There is no automatic resizing because there is no different physical size of display. Therefore, not only does Kung et al. not teach the limitations provided in Claims 14 and 26, but Kung et al. does not provide any motivation to be combined with the references of Kim, Sakai et al. and Makela et al. because Kung et al. only provides a function which is adjusted manually because Kung et al. has only disclosed a single sized display. Accordingly, for all of the reasons presented, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14 and 26 and their respective dependent claims are allowable.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check

Atty. Dkt. No. 035451-0180 (3728.Palm)

being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 14, 2004By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5730  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,603